

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/552,105 | SCHMIDT ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Phuoc H. Nguyen | 2143 | |

All Participants:

(1) Phuoc H. Nguyen.

(2) Edmund Walsh (Reg. No.: 32,950).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 2 March 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 17, and 19.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner suggests applicant representative to change the claim language of claim 1 and filing the Terminal Disclaimer due to obvious variation double patenting rejection which maybe lead the application into allowance. Applicant representative would agreed to do so in the next office action..